

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-13 and 15-21 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 and 15 have been amended, Claim 14 has been canceled and new Claim 21 has been added. Applicant has carefully considered the cited art and the Examiner's comments, but believes the claims as presented herein patentably distinguish over the cited art and are allowable in their present form. Reconsideration of the rejection is, accordingly, respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following comments.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-17 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Cook (U.S. Patent No. 6,650,888). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Cook discloses a system for handling transactions. In Cook, when a user enters an enterprise, a mobile telephone carried by the user is handed-off from a public wireless network to a wireless network of the enterprise. While in the enterprise, the user is enabled to communicate with a transaction manager through a wireless interface to carry out various transactions. The wireless interface includes a capability of receiving a speech sample of the user for validation purposes, and if the user is validated, a transaction is authorized.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate subject matter recited in original Claim 14. In particular, Claim 1 now recites, in part:

at least one remote access node for creating at least one extended designated area of said designated area for permitting a user of the portable unit to also access the computer infrastructure when the portable unit is within the at least one extended designated area.

Cook does not disclose at least one remote access node for creating at least one extended designated area of a designated area for permitting a user of a portable unit to also access the computer infrastructure of an organization when the user is within the at least one designated area. In rejecting original Claim 14, the Examiner refers to Column 5, lines 1-24 of Cook as disclosing this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Cook describes a server 124 that identifies and authorizes a user of a mobile telephone, and that transfers information to an authorized user through a wireless network of an enterprise when the user is within the enterprise. In Cook, if the user leaves the enterprise, the server transfers control of the mobile telephone back to a public wireless network, and is no longer able to communicate with the

user through the wireless network of the enterprise. Cook, accordingly, not only fails to disclose a remote access node for creating an extended designated area; but also teaches against providing such a capability.

Claim 1, accordingly, is not anticipated by Cook and should be allowable in its present form.

Claims 2-4, 6-10 and 12-13 depend from and further restrict Claim 1 and should also be allowable in their present form, at least by virtue of their dependency. Furthermore, many of these claims recite additional structure that is not disclosed in Cook.

For example, Claim 2 recites:

The wireless communications system according to Claim 1, wherein said user interface comprises a two-way voice interface and wherein a voice recognition unit and a voice generation unit are associated with said computer infrastructure interface to permit two-way voice communication between said user and said computer infrastructure.

Cook does not disclose that a voice generation unit is associated with the transaction manager interface therein. In Cook, the interface contains a voice recognition unit to receive a user speech sample for validation purposes. A voice generation unit, however, is not associated with the interface to permit two-way voice communication.

The Examiner refers to Col. 1, lines 33-34, Col. 8, lines 33-34 and item 1003 in Fig. 10 of Cook as disclosing a two-way voice interface. Item 1003 in Fig. 10 of Cook, however, is a microphone in the mobile telephone carried by the user to communicate with the interface of the transaction manager of the enterprise; and the recitations referred to by the Examiner relate to voice communication by the user. There is no disclosure that the transaction manager interface includes a voice generation unit for communicating with the user by voice.

Claim 2, accordingly, should be allowable in its own right as well as by virtue of its dependency from Claim 1.

Independent Claim 15 has been amended in a manner similar to Claim 1, and should be allowable for substantially the same reasons as discussed above with respect to Claim 1. In addition, Claim 15 also recites that a voice recognition unit and a voice generation unit are associated with the computer infrastructure interface. Claim 15, accordingly, should also be allowable for the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 2.

Claims 16-17 and 19-20 depend from and further restrict Claim 15 and should also be allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-17 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been overcome.

New Claim 21 has been added to more fully protect Applicant's invention. Claim 21 should be allowable for substantially the same reasons as discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The Examiner has rejected Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Odenwalder (U.S. Patent No. 6,396,804); and has rejected Claims 11 and 18 as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Wickstead (U.S. Publication No. US2002/0142734). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is well-known in the Patent Law that an Examiner, in rejecting a claim as being obvious over prior art, has the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. The requirements for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness in view of a combination of references are set forth in detail in Section 2142 of the MPEP and include the requirements that the Examiner explain in detail why the combination of the teachings is proper, that the Examiner provide a clear and convincing line of reasoning as to why an artisan would have found the claimed invention obvious in light of the teachings of the references, and that the Examiner provide a showing that it is the prior art and not the Applicant's own disclosure that teaches the combination asserted by the Examiner.

Applicant submits that the Examiner has not set forth the basis of the rejections of each of Claims 5, 11 and 18 in sufficient detail to satisfy the requirements for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to each of the claims.

In addition, Claims 5 and 11 depend from and further restrict Claim 1, and Claim 18 depends from and further restricts Claim 15. Neither Odenwalder nor Wickstead supplies the deficiencies in Cook as described above, and Claims 5, 11 and 18 should also be allowable in their present form by virtue of their dependency.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 5, 11 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome.


III. Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Claims 1-13 and 15-21 are believed to patentably distinguish over the cited art and to be allowable in their present form. It is, accordingly, respectfully requested that the Examiner so find and issue a Notice of Allowance in due course.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: May 10, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Gerald H. Glanzman
Reg. No. 25,035
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 367-2001
Attorney for Applicant